DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 351 HE 020 711

TITLE	Educational Access and Achievement in America. Proceedings of the Symposium Marking the Twentieth Anniversary of the Washington Office of the College Board (Washington, D.C., April 8, 1987).
INSTITUTION	College Entrance Examination Board, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	8 Apr 87
NOTE	38p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Access to Education; Agency Role; Black Students; *Educational Quality; Federal Aid; *Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; *Minority Groups; Policy Formation; *Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS	College Entrance Examination Board

ABSTRACT

Educational access and achievement in the United States are considered in these proceedings of a 1987 symposium sponsored by the College Board. Of concern are federal responsibility for education, what has been accomplished, and what remains to be done as public policy debate continues about how to achieve equity, excellence, and reform in U.S. education. After Alice M. Rivlin's keynote address, "Reflections on Twenty Years of Higher Education Policy," reactions by the following panel members are provided: Floretta D. McKenzie, James O. Freedman, and Chester E. Finn, Jr. Ms. Rivlin identifies common themes in policy debates 20 years ago and today: the need for a crisis in order to take action in policy making, the alternation of interest in distributive justice (access or equity) and the quality of the product that is distributed, ambivalence about the market mechanism in the United States, and a tension between public and private solutions to perceived dilemmas. The proceedings are concluded by College Board president Donald M. Stewart in the paper "Future Imperatives for American Education." The Board's mission of broadening and equalizing educational opportunity, trends in the federal government's commitment to education, and defining educational quality are addressed. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290351

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

College Board

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EDUCATIONAL ACCESS AND ACHIEVEMENT IN AMERICA

Proceedings of the symposium marking the twentieth anniversary of the Washington Office of The College Board

held on April 8, 1987, at The Charles Sumner School, Washington, D.C.

College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1987

Copyright © 1987 by College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved.
The College Board and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Entrance Examination Board.
Printed in the United States of America.

CONTENTS

Welcome and Introduction of the Twentieth-Anniversary Speaker *1*

Reflections on Twenty Years of Higher Education Policy, by Alice M. Rivlin *3*

Introduction of Panel Respondents *11*

Floretta D. McKenzie *13*

James O. Freedman *15*

Chester E. Finn, Jr. *18*

Introduction of Donald M. Stewart *22*

Future Imperatives for American Education, by Donald M. Stewart *23*

THE CHARLES SUMNER SCHOOL

The Setting of the Symposium

The Charles Sumner School, a National Historic Landmark, was originally dedicated in 1872. It reopened in November 1986 as a museum of public education, research archive, and conference facility.

More than any other schoolhouse built after the Civil War, the Charles Sumner School was the cornerstone in the development of educational opportunities for black students in the District of Columbia.

The first high school graduation of black students in the city was held here in 1877. Subsequently as a normal school, it shared in the development of the University of the District of Columbia; offered adult education, night classes, and health clinics; and supported a broad spectrum of other educational and administrative activities.

It was named for the U.S. Senator from Massachusetts who proposed the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Act in 1852 and was a vocal leader of the antislavery campaign.

In May 1985 the belfry and a peal of five bronze bells cast in England were installed on the Sumner School tower and dedicated to the life and works of Senator Sumner. The inscription is based on verses honoring the Senator, delivered at the time of the original dedication.

Praise to the man who still alone—
Now makes the freedman's cause his own;
His name shall sound from shore to shore
Till man is wronged by man no more.

Praise Massachusetts for her son—
Her work he always well has done;
Sing Sumner's name from shore to shore
Till white and black are known no more.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION OF TWENTIETH-ANNIVERSARY SPEAKER

Lawrence E. Gladieux

Trustees and officers of the College Board; members of the advisory panel to the Board's Washington Office; representatives of the administration, Congress, and the many national education associations based here in Washington; friends and colleagues—welcome to this College Board symposium on Educational Access and Achievement in America.

And welcome to the Charles Sumner School, site of the first graduation for black high school students in the District of Columbia more than one hundred years ago. This lovely building is an architectural as well as a historic landmark, which was fortunately saved from the wreckers' ball by a court order in 1979 and has just been restored. We thank the District's Board of Education and Superintendent Floretta McKenzie for permitting us to be guests of the Sumner School today.

This morning's symposium culminates two days of activities honoring the new president of the College Board, Donald M. Stewart, who will be introduced later in the morning, and marking the twentieth anniversary of the College Board's office in Washington.

We hope these proceedings prove to be a useful pause for reflection on the past two decades of federal responsibility for education, what has been accomplished, and what remains to be done as public policy debate continues about how to achieve equity, excellence, and reform of American education—and about who is responsible for these matters in our complicated federal system.

I can think of no one more likely to help stretch our thinking and vision on such issues than our first and principal speaker this morning, Alice Rivlin. Alice hardly needs a lengthy introduction to a Washington audience, so I will be brief. But I do consider it a special privilege to introduce her, and I am very grateful that she was willing to accept our invitation to deliver the keynote address.

Lawrence E. Gladieux is executive director of the Washington Office of the College Board.

The title of one of Alice Rivlin's books, *Systematic Thinking for Social Action*, published in 1971, suggests the character of her career and contributions—a dedication to clear, systematic analysis, presented in forceful, plain English to illuminate issues and choices for public policy.

That dedication, I might add, is partly what inspired the College Board to build a policy studies program here in Washington, beginning with the efforts of former vice president Lois Rice, encouraged by Alice and her associates at the Brookings Institution more than 15 years ago. Collaboration between the College Board and Brookings has continued ever since, especially in the area of higher education finance, and we've had the good fortune of working over the years with Brookings associates such as Chuck Byce, Dave Breneman, Bob Hartman, Art Hauptman, David Mundel, Susan Nelson, and Mike McPherson.

Alice left Brookings in 1975 to spend eight years as the first director of the Congressional Budget Office. She is now back at Brookings as director of economic studies.

In accepting our invitation today, Alice is revisiting issues that she addressed when she was Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Johnson Administration. In 1968 she wrote a report for the President, *Toward a Long-Range Plan for Federal Financial Support of Higher Education,* which came to be known as the Rivlin Report. It recommended that the federal government guarantee that *every* student with the ability to pursue higher education be able to do so, regardless of income, race, or place of residence. The Rivlin Report helped lay the groundwork for enactment of the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program, now called Pell Grants, and the great expansion of student aid in the 1970s.

Alice has asked me to bill her remarks as, simply, "Reflections on Twenty Years of Higher Education Policy"—a little less grandiose, she thought, than "Educational Access and Achievement in America," certainly appropriate for a twentieth-anniversary address, and especially appropriate as it's been almost twenty years since she wrote the Rivlin Report.

In 1983 Alice received the phone call that most of us will wait for forever—from the MacArthur Foundation. She was awarded one of MacArthur's unsolicited, no-strings-attached monetary awards to selected individuals of uncommon talent and originality. Theoretically, under the terms of the award she could have taken the money and run. But here she is, still at it, continuing to help groups like ours understand the complexities of public policy-making.

REFLECTIONS ON TWENTY YEARS OF HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY

Alice M. Rivlin

I am delighted to participate in this celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the College Board's Washington Office. The office is a high-quality place. Under the leadership of Ed Sanders, Lois Rice, and Larry Gladieux, it has been a source of credible analysis and important insights on student aid, equalizing opportunity for higher education, and ways to facilitate the financing of higher education for students and their families. The Washington Office has been the locus of sensible, constructive interaction between the world of politics and government and the world of higher education. Its contributions to sound higher education policy over the last 20 years are, indeed, something to celebrate.

When Larry Gladieux invited me to make this address, he suggested that the twentieth anniversary of the Washington Office would be an appropriate time to look back at two decades of higher education policy—a good time to ask what has happened since the late 1960s to our perceptions of higher education problems and notions of the feasibility of various kinds of policy.

So, with that challenge, I reexamined two reports issued approximately 20 years ago, near the end of the sixties and of the Johnson Administration. One was *Toward a Long-Range Plan for Federal Financial Support of Higher Education*, a report by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to President Johnson, which became known as the Rivlin Report because I drafted it and chaired a distinguished panel of advisers from different parts of the government. The second was *Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education*, issued by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, which became known as the Kerr Report after its distinguished chairman, Clark Kerr.

The two reports made broadly similar, although not identical, recommendations. This overlap was not accidental. Not only did the two reports reflect the thinking then current in the higher-education-policy

Alice M. Rivlin is director of the Economic Studies Program at the Brookings Institution. The views expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the opinions of trustees, officers, or other staff members of the Brookings Institution.

community, but also Clark and I were actually talking to each other. Indeed, among my favorite memories of that period are conversations with that dynamic, powerful, soft-spoken man. As many of you will remember, Clark was not only trying to straighten out education policy for the United States; he was personally trying to stop the Vietnam war. He would appear sometimes quite unexpectedly in my office, and I would get him to tell me about his latest mission to Moscow before we shared our thoughts about higher education.

When I went back to reread these two reports, I expected them to seem like musty archives reflecting the attitudes of another era, the facts and perceptions of a different world. But I was surprised at how contemporary they still seem. The numbers, of course, have changed, and there has been some shift in tone and emphasis. Nevertheless, the goals of higher education policy, the tools of that policy, and the options considered all seem quite familiar. We have not yet solved the problems that were perceived in the late sixties, but we are still trying.

The dual concerns with equalizing opportunity for higher education and enhancing its quality have not changed. Not surprisingly, the 1960s reports reflect a strong emphasis on the fact that low-income and minority young people were not getting equal chances to benefit from higher education. This is still true. Despite considerable effort and substantial public expenditures, we have not made a huge amount of visible progress on reducing these disparities. In retrospect what is striking about the rhetoric of the sixties is not the concern with equalizing opportunity but the faith that we knew how to do it. The reports reflect the belief that making more money available in the form of student aid would clearly be effective in equalizing enrollment rates between lower- and upper-income students and between blacks and whites. With hindsight, the faith of the sixties was quite touching. We believed that public policy could change things for the better, that simply increasing resources would make many difficulties and disparities disappear.

At the same time, little doubt is apparent in these reports that the additional resources existed and could be made available. Early in the sixties economists worried about "fiscal drag"—the tendency of the federal tax system to generate surpluses that might reduce growth in the economy if ways were not found to spend them. By the time these two reports were written, increased government spending for the Vietnam war had solved the fiscal drag problem, and the rhetoric had shifted to concern with how to spend the predicted postwar "Vietnam dividend." While the two reports certainly recognized that resources are not infinite —Rivlin and Kerr both being practitioners of the dismal science—they did not reflect the tone of fiscal restraint that pervades economic-policy thinking in the 1980s.

Although the emphasis was on equalizing opportunity, concern with

the quality of higher education was strong then, too. The reports expressed worries that undergraduates were not being well taught and that graduate education and research were somewhat less than excellent. No evidence of these assertions was offered, since no one had credible measures of the quality of education (a situation that has not appreciably changed). The reports reflect perceptions that more resources are a key to quality, that these resources should not be too fragmented (centers of excellence at the graduate level), and that imbalances by field (too much science, not enough humanities) should be corrected.

The reasons then offered for concern with the quality of higher education had to do with keeping ahead in the geopolitical competition with the Soviets. Today they have to do with keeping ahead in the economic competition with the Japanese. The reasons are not really important, as long as we don't forget that quality has always been a concern and should remain so.

Both reports reflected strenuous efforts on the part of the authors to reconcile conflicting views about policy within the higher education community and delineate compromises acceptable to competing constituencies. It is my impression that the splits over policy within higher education were deeper then than they are now—and more ideological. At that time there was strong competition between the proponents of institutional aid and the advocates of student aid. The advocates of institutional aid envisioned a major, federal, formula-grant program that would give general support to all institutions of higher education. This position was popular among public institutions; many saw it as a first step toward universal, free, public, higher education, financed, at least partly, by the federal government. Another group—deemed quite pernicious by the first—stressed the desirability of a student aid approach. They regarded funding of students as a more efficient mechanism for equalizing opportunities in higher education (a position I still subscribe to), as well as a superior way to enhance the quality of higher education through harnessing market forces (a much more dubious proposition).

A vociferous and often none-too-polite debate between the student aid and institutional aid proponents had raged for years, and both reports sought a compromise. The ingenious solution proposed by both was never adopted on a major scale—namely, supplementing student aid with cost-of-education allowances. Federally aided students would carry with them to any institution at which they were accepted for admission, an entitlement to institutional aid to help defray the cost of their education. Kerr and Rivlin thought this an extremely clever way of supplying both institutional and student aid while utilizing the market mechanism to encourage institutions to meet the need of lower-income students—but apparently the politicians were not impressed with our ingenuity.

Within the student aid group raged an equally vociferous argument between the proponents of loans and of grants. Advocates of income-related grants to students thought them much the best way of enhancing opportunities without burdening the students with future repayments. Advocates of loans stressed the desirability of shifting the burden of paying for higher education to the principal beneficiaries and getting them to pay back the cost to society out of their enhanced future incomes. A subset of the loan advocates was fascinated with the possibility of contingent (income-related) repayments. This hardy perennial among public policy proposals is attractive because, like supply-side economics, it promises a free lunch. Students get education, and society gets repaid without burdening the least fortunate. It's an attractive idea, but we haven't yet figured out how to make it work. I predict that, like apparently painless, but really quite costly, higher education tax credits, the contingent repayment loan proposal will reappear every time there is perceived to be a crisis in the financing of higher education.

Differences of views about desirable higher education aid mechanisms still exist, but in the eighties the debate, at least within the higher education community itself, is far less strident and ideological than it was in the sixties. Probably because of the perceived scarcity of resources, advocates of aid to higher education are more pragmatic, more willing to settle for eclectic solutions. The feeling has grown that students, families, various levels of government, corporations, and others *all* have to contribute to the support of higher education in different ways. The College Board has been one of the important institutions seeking common ground and compromise positions among the diverse higher education constituencies.

In rereading the two reports I was struck with one other difference between then and now: neither report mentions high schools or any other level of education. As I suspect Superintendent McKenzie may point out later, higher education cannot usefully be viewed as an entirely separate institution unrelated to other levels of education and the society at large, but apparently this point was less obvious in the late sixties than it is now.

In short, as I reviewed these reports I did not notice any fundamentally different perception of higher education needs and options at the time they were written than we have today. Indeed, I was more strongly reminded of how much higher education policy is a reflection of all the conflicts and tensions that characterize the public policy debate in the United States generally, whether the subject is education, or medical care, or protecting the environment, or conserving energy, or defending the country. Higher educators, students, parents, and education-oriented politicians tend to think of colleges and universities as requiring a unique type of policy and subject to unique political forces. What strikes

me, however, as one who has spent a lifetime in Washington dabbling in a variety of public issues, is how the same themes recur and the same forces have to be dealt with in each policy area. Let me review some of these common themes.

The first characteristic of policy-making is the need for a crisis. In higher education, as in other areas of public policy, the American political system seems unable to engage in a serious debate about policy change—let alone to undertake action—unless some form of doom is widely felt to be impending.

In the 1960s, the crisis in higher education related to the prospect of absorbing rapid increases in enrollment. In the 1970s, it related to the prospect of declining enrollment. At various times the crisismongers have invoked the imminent demise of some type of institution: the death of the liberal arts college, the vanishing private higher education sector, or even, believe it or not, the special plight of the research university. When all else fails, the quality of higher education can always be deplored. In the 1980s Secretary Bennett is suddenly concerned that nobody in college is learning anything anymore.

The requirement for a crisis before taking action is certainly not unique to higher education. In the early 1980s, the impressively functioning social security system needed minor adjustment. No one had predicted the simultaneous occurence of high inflation and low growth rates, so reserves were being drawn down too rapidly. The adjustment needed was actually rather small, but the political system apparently could not make the repairs without invoking a crisis, scaring old people into thinking the system might go bankrupt and that they might not get their checks (never a real possibility). So a presidential commission was appointed and engaged in major summit negotiations worthy of an international crisis before making the fix. Repairs were made, although, indeed, most of the country doesn't seem to know that, and now economists are worried about the implications of the rapid buildup of surpluses in the social security system expected in the next 10 or 15 years. These kinds of worries keep economists off the streets.

Similarly, we built a lot of roads and bridges in the United States 20 to 30 years ago and then discovered that they eventually wear out and have to be repaired. This seems a rather mundane discovery. One would think that funds for repair and maintenance could be set aside routinely, but in the United States we seem to need to have a crisis first. We need books with titles like *America in Ruins*, and magazine covers showing crumbling pillars, and even a few deaths of unsuspecting motorists. After all this, as with social security, we will take the obvious actions needed to repair the damage. By the same token there is the urban crisis, the farm crisis, the debt crisis, etc. Clearly we need the rhetoric. Consider for a moment what would happen to a secretary of education who

went around the country saying higher education in the United States is *not* in crisis. Suppose he or she said: Higher education is strong, varied, has many good aspects, but it could also be a little better without enormous effort, and here are a few suggestions for improving it. If such a person could indeed be appointed, I suspect he or she would not last long in the job!

A second common characteristic of policy debates is the alternation of interest in distributive justice (access or equity) and the quality of the product that is distributed. At a high level of aggregation, emphasis alternates between enhancing economic growth and equalizing distribution of income. The 1960s were preoccupied with distibutional questions—especially poverty. Considerable progress was made in the sixties in reducing poverty, although with hindsight it appears that the rapid economic growth of the period probably made more difference in reducing the number of poor people than the distibutional programs. Indeed, this supposed trade-off may be a false one. Not that there aren't reasons for concern that progressive tax and transfer programs may undermine incentives to work, but it is certainly true that if the economy is growing rapidly it is much easier to finance and defend programs to aid low-income people.

In medical care there are the same swings. We worry about access for a while, and then we discover that the system to which we have given people access leaves a great deal to be desired or that it costs too much, and then we go on a quality kick, followed by a cost control binge. And defense is the same thing. Rather than defend the country in an orderly, high-quality way we first buy too much of everything and then we cut back so rapidly that forces and equipment cannot be effectively used.

Now this somewhat cynical view raises the question, which I think is a serious question, of whether grown-ups with human brains can't indeed start trying to keep more than one goal in mind at the same time. We've got lots of computers now to help us sort things out and keep all the complexities and the many dimensions in front of us. Why does political action seem to require this lurching—this building momentum in one direction, going too far, and then correcting it?

A third common characteristic of American public policy-making, which it seems to me is very evident in higher education, is our intense ambivalence about the market mechanism. On the one hand, we believe in consumer sovereignty. We hold sacred the idea that people should get what they want, and that markets are the best way of transmitting signals from consumers to producers and getting the most efficient possible production to meet those needs. Indeed, we make a big deal of the superiority of our market-oriented, consumer-directed system over Communist, centrally directed systems that produce the wrong mix of products and produce them inefficiently.

Now, of course, we know that markets don't always work efficiently—that's another thing that keeps economists busy. But it is the other ambivalence with which I am concerned at the moment: that the self-appointed guardians of the public good, those who know best, are always just a little nervous about markets when they *do* work, because, in fact, we don't like the results very much. We bemoan the quality of mass culture, the taste of television viewers and of book buyers. We lament the fact that, while airline deregulation means that we can get to Los Angeles very cheaply, the service to Kalamazoo has been cut back.

In the higher education context we bemoan the choices that students make when they are given a free choice of courses. The silly things flock into bread-and-butter courses and shun the exquisite interpretations of art and moral dilemmas that professors really enjoy teaching. We worry that the small, rural, liberal arts colleges that served the needs of yesteryear may not survive the market test, or that black colleges or single-sex colleges that served a market in an earlier era may not serve this market. We're not very good at sorting out nostalgia and inertia from more genuine reasons for fighting to preserve what consumers are no longer voting for.

Fourth, there is a related tension that runs through so much of policy—the tension between public and private solutions to our perceived dilemmas. The public–private debate pervades higher education, and it pervades other areas, as well. And we are concerned, as a nation, to provide some of each. We fear that the public sector, if it takes over, will create massive bureaucracies, unresponsiveness, and maybe even poor quality, and may perhaps take control of processes that should be free. There isn't a lot of evidence of this, by the way, but we fear it nevertheless and worry simultaneously that "private" means elitist and may mean exploitative. Hence we go, rightly so, to great lengths to preserve some of each: a private provision of publicly financed goods and services. We have it in defense; we have it in health and health insurance; and we have it in higher education.

The result is that "public" and "private" begin to blur, and nowhere is this more evident than in higher education, where private and public major universities are hardly distinguishable. I'm not knocking this; it is probably good. But we should recognize that we often have preserved a distinction without a difference.

And, of course, there is the creative tension between the federal and the state and local levels that pervades all of these issues. This town and this office, whose anniversary we celebrate, are very much focused on the feds, but there is much action at other levels. Recently states have been among the most important areas of growth and creativity. And I predict that the nation will move more and more in this direction as it matures.

So, what of the next 20 years? Let me make a plea for balance and reason in threading our way in higher education through these various dilemmas that pervade all of policy.

First, I don't perceive a crisis in higher education, but I don't think we ought to need one to reassess periodically the strengths and weaknesses of our system, to readjust policy, to strengthen the weaker elements, and to carry on the whole enterprise. We should get over the need to feel that things are going to hell and we can't do anything to make them better.

Second is a plea for thinking about access, or equity, or distribution, *and* quality at the same time and in the same mental exercise. I don't believe that's beyond our capacity. We needn't be sixties-naive about either one. Nothing's easy. Money isn't going to buy automatic change either in access to higher education or in quality. But it isn't irrelevant. Money helps, and we've got to think about how to use it wisely in both dimensions.

Third is a plea for less fear of what consumers choose, even if they're young and even if they make mistakes. The courage to face the fact that some kinds of courses, and some kinds of institutions, and some kinds of arrangements may have to give way to new ones is important in the higher education enterprise.

Fourth, a plea for faith in state and local governments' capacity to grow and change and solve problems in new ways. While we worry about the federal role—and indeed we should, and in Washington this is what we do—we shouldn't forget that it is not the whole picture.

Fifth is a plea for realizing that education is a continuing lifetime process. It starts at home; it goes through school; it doesn't end with college or graduate school. It's not a good idea to try to carve out a few years in the middle and call it higher education and act as though this were a distinct activity. It is not that we shouldn't have higher education policy; I'm only arguing for making it less isolated from what goes on in the rest of our public policy, particularly education.

And finally a plea for not losing touch with the faith of the sixties that change is possible even if it's slow. It *is* slow and it's hard and it will always be hard. But if we stop believing that we can change things and that money—while not the only thing that matters—does matter and can make things easier, we're going to be in deep trouble.

Now if I'm right about the directions in which we need to think and what the debate ought to be about in the next 20 years, then I am profoundly glad, and I think that you all should be glad that we have the College Board and particularly that we have its Washington Office. I believe that it will continue to be a high-quality place, as it has been, that we will continue to see here concern with students getting access and concern that the access be access to something worth having access to.

INTRODUCTION OF PANEL RESPONDENTS

Kenneth H. Ashworth

When I saw Peter Muirhead, former U.S. Deputy Commissioner of Education, in the audience, I was reminded of an introduction that he got 20 years ago. I don't know whether you'll remember this, Peter. It was in Santa Fe. The introducer said his purpose was to cast good will and good feelings among the group and to spread perfume over the occasion and then he proceeded to give Peter Muirhead a flowery introduction and Peter got up and said, "I haven't been perfumed, I've been fumigated."

My introduction of today's distinguished panelists will be brief.

Floretta McKenzie became superintendent of schools here in the District of Columbia in 1981, having come through the ranks as a teacher, counselor, and administrator. Along the way she directed the Opportunity Project for Education Now (OPEN), a talent-search agency funded by the U.S. Office of Education and administered by the College Board. Her distinguished career has included service in the federal government as well as state and local school systems. She was the first woman to serve in the post of deputy commissioner in the U.S. Office of Education. She has worked for the state of Maryland and Montgomery County schools, as well as here in the District, so she finds it difficult on any occasion like this to manage to get through without being quoted in the *Washington Post*. Flo is currently a Trustee of the College Board and previously served as a member of the Advisory Panel to the Washington Office.

Flo McKenzie will be followed by James Freedman, president of the University of Iowa since 1982. He earned his law degree from Yale University, served as a clerk for Judge Thurgood Marshall, practiced law in New York, and served as the dean of the law school at the University of Pennsylvania. He has served higher education in many capacities, received several honorary degrees, and written many books and articles on administrative law, legal education, and related topics. (I've scrutinized the credentials of the panelists and found all of them to be overeducated for the jobs they occupy!)

The third panelist is Chester Finn, known to his friends in this room as Checker. In preparation for his present job he has held many interest-

---

Kenneth H. Ashworth is Texas Commissioner of Higher Education and chairman of the Advisory Panel to the Washington Office.

ing posts: legislative director for Senator Daniel Moynihan, research associate with the Brookings Institution, counsel to the American ambassador in India, special assistant to the governor in Massachusetts, and staff assistant to the President in the White House. He has written on a number of issues and has gained a good deal of notoriety on both sides of every issue he's ever written on. He's a critic and gadfly of education policy, and it serves him right that he is now being held accountable for the administration of education policy as the Assistant Secretary of Education for Research and Development.

Floretta D. McKenzie

I am indeed pleased to participate on the panel in reaction to Alice Rivlin's very cogent observations on twenty years of education policy-making.

I'm also pleased that I was a part of the College Board activity in Washington in the 1960s. The Washington Office was really ahead of the curve in trying to provide opportunities for minority and disadvantaged youth, because it served as the convener of colleges and universities in this city to develop and sponsor the first talent-search agency in the District of Columbia, and I was its first director. Project OPEN was actually housed in the Washington Office in its early days.

Those were some very interesting times, and, while I like to reminisce and listen to reminiscences, I find nostalgia isn't quite what it used to be. Some of us do remember that at the very beginning of the so-called TRIO programs, we felt somewhat like Ellison's invisible man or invisible woman. Nobody really wanted to see us at the admissions conferences—until the death of Martin Luther King, Jr. Cataclysmic events jarred the social consciousness of the country, and after the assassination we were actually in demand. People were looking to us to find talented minority and disadvantaged students.

Yes, in the 1960s there was a lot of activity directed at equal access and equal opportunity. There were new resources, and there was more of a belief back then that resources could make a difference. But there is a faddism in this country. We can't seem to sustain our interest in any major issue. Our interest waxes and wanes, and then we move on to something else.

I'm certainly not convinced that fewer resources are the answer. Offering larger loans to disadvantaged students will reduce opportunity. In the sixties we not only were concerned with equal access, but we also thought that students should have a choice as to the institutions they would attend. We thought it made a difference for minority and disadvantaged students to enter the elite private colleges. We thought it made sense. But these days, as the cost of attending college continues to escalate and the number of people in poverty seems to increase, it's not easy to convince students in our high schools to go into debt to pay for a college education and then do something good for society. We all want to improve the quality of teachers—but think about borrowing $50,000

Floretta D. McKenzie is Superintendent of Schools and Chief State School Officer, Washington, D.C.

on your education, then starting a job making close to $20,000 as a beginning teacher. That doesn't quite catch most folks' fancy.

Yes, we're concerned today about quality. In the sixties we focused more on quantity, the numbers of youngsters graduating from high school and going on to college. Now we're asking what they know when they leave high school, and maybe one day we'll ask what they know when they leave colleges and universities.

Those of us on the firing line in public education are having to demonstrate that it is not Management by Objectives revisited. In those times, you would set the objectives so low that you could meet them. Nowadays you must really tell taxpayers what the dollars are being used for, and then exactly what results you expect.

The role of the College Board is to assist in the transition from secondary to postsecondary education. We're still grappling with that issue, and we still have far to go in building partnerships within education. We've talked a great deal about crossing lines and developing alliances between the corporate private sector and the public schools. But the natural, symbiotic relationships between the colleges and universities and the secondary schools have not been established to the degree necessary to provide an effective transition. There is not that natural flow, that understanding of a continuity of programs, the building of a career path, that really make sense to all of us.

Part of our failure, I believe, is that we are not a country given to meaningful strategic planning. We know that there is a change in demographics, that there is differential birth rate, where minorities are having more children than the present majority, that toward the end of this century over a third of the school population will be blacks, Hispanics, and other ethnic groups. In some states the minority will become the majority. Instead of just waiting to see that happen, we should try to successfully anticipate the change.

We've got to come together so that we don't waste the resources available to us, so that 20 years from now we're not talking about the same thing. I think that our mission as educators has not changed significantly in its raw definition. The mission simply reflects a more complex society, a global society, a "mediatized" society, a society whose members need to know clearly that while more is expected from education, members of the community will also have to give more. The saying is accurate: "If you think education is expensive, try ignorance." Now is the time to invest. We need to remind ourselves and our communities, in the words of Winston Churchill, that "We make a living by what we get, but we make a life by what we give." We are at the point where we need to move away from a "me society" to a "we society," and I think we were closer to a we society in the sixties than we are today. But we see some little twinklings that seem to say we can make that turn again.

James O. Freedman

I am struck by Alice Rivlin's mention of crisis as a prerequisite to policy-making. The recurrent sense of crisis, a problem to be solved on a crash basis, only to be followed by another crisis formulated in different terms, seems to me characteristic of a great deal that has gone on in this country, not only in the last 20 years since the Rivlin Report but in the last half century. Much of what one can say about the role of bureaucracy in American government starts with the belief in the 1930s that administrative agencies could cure our ills. The agencies were expert, they had resources, they were neither legislatures nor courts, they had a greater flexibility to look at the new problems of an industrial society. Then crises came—and each time we tried to respond with either greater judicial intervention to assure fairness or with passage of statutes to regulate the way administrators conducted themselves. Each time we thought we had solved the crisis, only to find that the crisis appeared in another form.

I think one of the more unfortunate aspects of American higher education in the last 20 years has been precisely what Alice Rivlin has noted. We have had difficulties to overcome, and, instead of approaching them in a reasoned and calm way, we have looked at them as crises. But what crisis does is to inflame the rhetoric, incite the action, and make us think that quick fixes are adequate, rather than steady, sustained attention to the problem.

The problem of bringing poor children into our institutions, for example, has been addressed by crisis kinds of measures. They worked for a period of time, but now we find ourselves again facing the problem of how we bring minority citizens into the main current of American life. In higher education, the participation of minorities, both as students and as faculty members, remains a major national challenge.

When Alice Rivlin suggests that it is not the rhetoric of crisis and the response of spasm that are likely to solve these problems but rather a long-term commitment to what it is we want to do, I think she is entirely right.

One of the difficulties with the pattern of crisis and response is that so many of the conditions we face, especially in higher education, are conditions about which we are ambivalent. When one asks what a liberal education should look like, what its shape and content should be, the

---

James O. Freedman, formerly president of the University of Iowa, is now president of Dartmouth College.

many answers one gets are remarkably diverse. If one asks how we should go about increasing the number of minority students who get Ph.D.s in chemistry, physics, engineering, and many of the other areas in academe where role models are essential, again there is ambivalence in terms of whether we are prepared to pay the price and whether we are prepared to make the necessary efforts in science teaching at the elementary level. So both the rhetoric of crisis and the response of ambivalence seem to be enemies, not friends, of moving forward to meet national needs in education.

What *are* the needs in education today? One is clearly the necessity to emphasize liberal education. All of us are concerned about the premature vocationalism and preprofessionalism that we see in our colleges. This is hardly a brand-new problem. Let me read from Henry Adams's autobiography, when he describes the college of his day and the commencement of 1858, his own commencement. He looks at his classmates sitting in Harvard Yard about to get their degrees, and he writes, "If any one of us had any ambition higher than that of making money or a love purer than that of self, he has been slow to express it." That statement may capture the outlook of many people today, and yet I am persuaded that students in the 1980s, as much as students of the 1960s, yearn for opportunities to serve. If they could get support from all the rest of us, from the family context, the social and university context, they would respond. Yet we have been slow to foster the outlets for altruism that my generation, which graduated from college in the fifties and from professional schools in the sixties, was able to tap. If we chose to, we were able to go into the Peace Corps. We were able, if we chose to be lawyers, to serve in the civil rights division of the justice department. Outlets for altruism for this generation of students need to be defined. The impulse to serve one's community must be nurtured, and that is a role for higher education, particularly liberal education.

I think all of us know as well that we are failing to educate students for the world community. We are failing in our instruction in foreign languages and international studies of all kinds. If one looks at the major international crises involving the United States since World War II, one sees that we were ill equipped as a nation to understand them, either historically or intellectually.

I've just returned from several weeks in China, and what is striking is the vastness of the mistakes we made because of our ignorance of the Chinese people, of what Chinese nationalism is about, and where the true roots of support lay in China in the years before liberation in 1949. Similarly, if one looks at our great national disaster in Vietnam one appreciates that we had in our universities no scholars who were capable of speaking Vietnamese, let alone understanding that culture or that part of

the world. If one looks at the hostage crisis in Iran, one learns that we had in this country only a handful of people capable of speaking Farsi and able to understand the tide of Islamic revolution that was sweeping the Middle East and that we somehow thought we could ignore. The crisis we now face is in Latin America, one in which language competence is less an issue than an understanding of the peoples of that region.

These are matters of serious, national concern that call for long-term, sustained response.

There are other issues, as well. I'm troubled by the belief, increasingly common in state government and among governors and state legislatures, that universities are primarily engines of economic development, and that the support of universities ought to be contingent upon what they can do for the economic development of their particular state. Public universities, of course, have an obligation in the area of economic development to the extent that the taxpayers of the state have created them. Taxpayers are entitled to hope that universities will be one of the attractions that a state can hold out to economic development. But universities, after all, are primarily places to educate students and to conduct research that faculty members believe is important. To make funding of public universities increasingly contingent on the connection to economic development raises serious questions about support of the central activities of universities.

Finally, I was taken by the tone of Alice Rivlin's remarks. Although we have not solved a great many of the problems identified in the sixties, we continue to work on them. It seems to me that much of the rhetoric of higher education is a rhetoric of paradise lost, and this somehow is premised on the belief that once upon a time there was a paradise that has been lost, and it is now our obligation to regain it. I'm not sure there ever was a paradise; there's no question we have a way to go before we regain any paradise we once may have had. As we address the need for liberal education, the importance of international studies, the necessity of raising the aspirations of our students and supporting them in their desire for altruism and idealism and for jobs that make a positive contribution to society, as we resist the pressure for prevocationalism at the undergraduate level, it is imperative that we do these things with steadiness and persistence. We must have advocates in society who repeat such messages again and again, so that they become a part of the conventional wisdom.

Chester E. Finn, Jr.

From College Board events of the past, I've acquired a reputation as someone likely to say something outrageous. I'm going to play down that reputation today, but I do want to say a few things about three troublesome tendencies that have developed in higher education policy-making over the last 20 years. I also want to mention several lessons that policy-making at the elementary and secondary levels may have to offer.

The three tendencies that bother me are familiar to all of us. First, the mounting complexity of higher education policy at the federal level is reaching the point at which only a handful of people in the nation understand the ins and outs of the issues, the laws, the regulations, and the alternative proposals. This is a dangerous trend. Public policy-making should not be left in the hands of experts and technicians, regardless of their persuasion. These people, whom Irving Kristol has called "the new class," end up with too much control, a fact that may not become obvious until one reads the fine print—if ordinary mortals can. I think there's too much fine print. It's too fussy, too detailed, too elaborate. Higher education policy has become unnecessarily and extraordinarily complex. That's one reason so many people choose not to participate in making public policy. Wherein lies the danger: Without public involvement in policy-making, the public interest can easily get lost.

My second concern has to do with the escalation of problems to higher levels of government. Problems that arise at the state level—often they're problems that states have created and done little to resolve—tend to get thrust into the lap of the federal government. Consider, for example, the way states have traditionally dealt with financing public and private institutions, resulting in a dual pricing structure of higher education. Naturally this yields problems, which are then carted to Washington for solutions. I would like to suggest that this is but one of a number of the higher education policy issues currently lodged in Washington that would be better dealt with at the state level.

The third thing that bothers me has to do with the cloaking of private gains in raiments of "the public interest." This phenomenon is, of course, not unique to education, let alone to higher education. In every

Chester E. Finn, Jr., is Assistant Secretary for Research and Development and Counselor to the Secretary, U.S. Department of Education.

realm of public policy I know of, private interests occasionally get voiced in terms of the common good. However, in higher education policy-making, responsible people have begun to notice that beneath the lofty rhetoric there's something akin to blatant self-interest. The debate in higher education is going to need to distinguish more clearly between what's good for higher education and what's good for the greater public interest. I know it's unfashionable, at least in academe, to say so; but I don't regard these interests as invariably congruent.

These are three concerns about higher education policy as it has evolved in Washington of late. I'd like now to turn to elementary and secondary education policy, an area that has gone through some important changes over the last few years. Some of these changes have already begun to affect higher education, and I believe they offer lessons worth noting.

Until recently, it had been generally assumed that the amount of resources going into elementary and secondary education predicted and determined the amount of learning coming out. To increase student learning, the reasoning went, it was essential to increase funding for the system. We now know that this reasoning doesn't hold up. As a result, attention at the elementary and secondary levels has begun to shift away from input and to focus more on output. Policymakers' decisions are based less on resources, more on results—demonstrable, measurable results. And the concern about taxpayers' getting their money's worth has grown. We're spending tons on elementary and secondary education—in the vicinity of $4,000 per year per student, or roughly $100,000 for each classroom of 25 kids. That's the average investment the American public makes these days in public education. How many people think they're getting $100,000 worth out of the typical public school classroom?

This concern about quality is being raised in a subtler form around the issue of education equity. Providing *access* to education resources for the disadvantaged, the handicapped, and minorities doesn't suffice. Today's question is, are these students coming out of the system in possession of an education? I suspect that this new obsession with outcomes and quality at the elementary and secondary levels will, in time, characterize higher education as well.

Quality is difficult to improve, let alone demonstrate, without satisfactory means of gauging education outcomes. Heroic efforts are being made in elementary and secondary education to devise dependable, workable means of assessment. Sure, there's a long way to go yet. But in higher education, for all the talk about quality, indicators and measures are even worse. Some of the primitive quality and outcome measures we have for elementary and secondary education do not even exist

for higher education. This complicates the task of improving quality—a big issue and a necessary task for higher education. Consider the following evidence.

In 1985 a study was conducted to determine the literacy skills of young adults in the United States. Some 40,000 households were contacted nationwide in order to assess approximately 3,600 individuals between the ages of 21 and 25. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reported the findings of this study in a fine 1986 report, *Literacy: Profiles of America's Young Adults*.

Skills were measured in three general areas: the ability to read prose, to read documents, and to calculate. In the first area, participants were given a newspaper column written by Tom Wicker. They were asked to read it and summarize the main argument. Only 21 percent of the full sample could. In the second area, handling documents, participants were given a bus schedule and asked to find which bus departed at a certain time from a certain place and arrived at a particular location. Only 20 percent of them could do it. In the third area, quantitative literacy, they were asked to order two items from a menu and calculate the change they would receive and a 10 percent tip. Again, only one in five could do this.

When comparing college graduates to those with less education, we found good news. As you might expect, college graduates out-performed others in all three areas. Roughly twice as many, about 40 percent of our college graduates, were able to distill the essence of the newspaper column, decipher the bus schedule, and calculate a tip. Yet—and here is the bad news—this means that approximately 60 percent could not. This suggests to me that most of our college graduates cannot perform rather basic literacy and mathematical tasks.

Does this signal a crisis? I leave it to you to decide whether to use that word. Alice Rivlin prefers not to. But I think we all agree: our college graduates' performance was not impressive. I see it as indicative of why the public has grown increasingly concerned about the shortcomings and the overall quality of colleges and universities.

I'd like to leave the quality issue now and talk about another development of fundamental importance in education policy-making: the shift of leadership from localities to the state level. This shift, which began in the 1970s, has made local governments the junior partners and states the senior partners in the financing of public education. Public education is no longer a predominantly local undertaking. More and more, policy leadership on education issues and reforms is also coming from state capitals.

Also changing in the domain of education policy are the participants and players. Today, the dominant education policy-makers in this coun-

try are elected officials at the state level—governors and legislators. And while they occasionally exhibit the kinds of tendencies that James Freedman lamented a few minutes ago, the most important thing to note here is that officials in every state have figured out that education is, without exception, the largest single item in their budgets. They have also discovered that they don't get struck by lightning when they show an interest in education and try to do something about it.

The upshot of all this is that the special-purpose governance system we invented for education at the end of the nineteenth century is fast disappearing. Education governance, at least for elementary and secondary education, is shifting out of the hands of lay boards, experts, and professionals and into the hands of the general-purpose government. I regard this as healthy, for I think the strongest motivating forces for education reform in this country are the occupants of the 50 governors' offices. And I see the future implications for the governance of higher education as enormous. If an analogous shift were to take place in the governance of higher education, I think, in time, we might be pleased with the results. And I predict that, in time, we'll have the opportunity to find out.

INTRODUCTION OF DONALD M. STEWART

Lawrence E. Gladieux

To conclude this morning's program, it is now my pleasure to introduce the new president of the College Board, Donald Stewart. I say "new." Don has, in fact, been on the job about a hundred days, since early January. And I can tell you that this organization is already feeling the energy, drive, enthusiasm, and the questioning, probing intelligence that mark Don Stewart's style as a manager and leader of organizations.

Don comes to the Board after 10 years as president of Spelman College, the 105-year-old historically black women's college in Atlanta, Georgia. I won't attempt to summarize the extensive biographical information printed in your program. Suffice it to say that, while I have known Don as a friend and colleague for some years, I continue to be impressed, sometimes amazed, by the breadth and reach of his career in public service and education, both here and abroad, and by what he has accomplished. I don't know quite how he has done it all—and continues to do it all. But I think I speak for all of us at the College Board: We are excited at the potential of his fresh leadership.

FUTURE IMPERATIVES FOR AMERICAN EDUCATION

Donald M. Stewart

When Alice Rivlin accepted our invitation to deliver the principal address at this symposium, I was delighted. Twenty years ago she was already an acknowledged expert on the role of the federal government in financing education. I, for one, am glad that she has stayed the course over all these years and is still making sense out of the enormously complex ways in which things get done in this city and in the nation.

I was originally asked to do a "wrap-up" of your efforts this morning. But they need no "wrapping," and I think I would prefer instead to say just a bit about the College Board in Washington and my view of our future imperatives for American education.

I am pleased to be here helping to celebrate the good sense of the College Board in establishing an office in Washington, and what a great pleasure it has been to meet Ed Sanders, our first Washington Office director. For one thing, unlike Charles Sumner—who is, in spirit, our host here today—I happen to like this city very much. Mr. Sumner, who suffered a brutal physical assault from an adversary on the floor of the Senate, called Washington "a barbarous place, full of barbarians—in manner, conversation, speech, conduct, principles, [and] life."

That's a pretty thorough criticism, I guess, but then, as Carl Sandburg once said of Mr. Sumner, "in vituperations, he was peerless."

I support many of the great abolitionist's principles, but about his assessment of Washington I must disagree. Some people may find the shores of the Potomac a "barbarous" place in the midst of a hot and humid summer. But today let's hope we settle our differences in less violent ways than Mr. Sumner encountered. Democratic politics in our nation's capital reflect the country in microcosm. And, notwithstanding the anti-government rhetoric in political fashion during the past decade, Washington is, after all, the nation's center for attempting to work on behalf of the common good.

Indeed, that was the principal reason the College Board opened an office here early in 1967, to serve as a "listening post" for the Board and

Donald M. Stewart is president of the College Board.

its members. Twenty years ago, the Higher Education Act had just been passed and the political and ideological battles over the legitimacy of federal aid to education were essentially over. Educational equity had become the overriding imperative of federal policy. Federal support for education was growing rapidly.

In the intervening years, the Washington Office has moved well beyond the role of "listening post" to play a prominent role in carrying out the Board's mission of broadening and equalizing educational opportunity.

Beginning in the mid-1970s, with support from the Ford Foundation, it built a program of policy research that is widely respected for its quality, objectivity, and, we hope, usefulness to public policymakers. Today, with the resources of the Washington Office and the College Scholarship Service in New York, the College Board is a major contributor to the evolving debate over how society should pay for higher education.

More recently, as some of the action and initiative in education policymaking has shifted to the state capitals, so, too, have the responsibilities of the Washington Office. In a relatively short time, the office has done an admirable job of establishing the College Board as a resource to state as well as federal policymakers.

And, of course, being here in the nation's capital permits the Board to work closely with other national education associations. As one of the few major associations *not* headquartered in Washington, the Board relies on its Washington arm to keep our partnerships with other organizations strong and constructive. In that spirit, we are very pleased now to be a member of the Higher Education Secretariat at One Dupont Circle.

Despite the slackening of financial support during the term of the current administration, education in the mid-1980s has emerged as a major focus of national policy debates. Issues in student finance at both the federal and state levels are going to remain of central interest. And other developments—such as legislative initiatives that affect testing, standards, assessment, accountability, and reform in general—mean that the Board will have plenty of issues to address.

Personally, I will continue to take a keen interest in what we can do in Washington to contribute to the formation of education policy in a postive way. And we all know that sometimes, to get the attention of public policymakers, we have to fire cannons. I intend to be, as Longfellow described Charles Sumner, "a cannoneer, ramming down cartridges."

Some of what I say may not be entirely to the liking of my good friend, Bill Bennett, for whom I have the highest regard. Bill and I have many similar interests and values, and I support totally his position on

educational quality. He has been firing a few salvos of his own, and he has done a great deal of good in the past few years in keeping education squarely in the public consciousness. I just wish Bill were as good at fighting for funds for education as Caspar Weinberger is for defense.

Clearly, now is *not* the time for the federal government to scale back its commitment to education. Yes, I'm sympathetic to efforts to target federal funding on the poor and the lower middle class, but appropriations are being cut too lean. The recent Washington Office report *Student Loans: Are They Overburdening a Generation?*, prepared by Janet Hansen for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, showed an alarming growth in federal loans over the past 10 years at the same time that the real value of grants has declined. An entire generation of our students—mostly middle- and lower-income students—may be overburdened by loans in the years ahead. The disproportionate impact on students at traditionally black colleges was documented only last week by the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities and the United Negro College Fund. As a recent president of a member institution of the United Negro College Fund, I am deeply aware of and concerned about the problem.

Blacks and other minorities have suffered as a result of two trends: the overall decline in the real or inflation-adjusted value of student financial aid, and a change in the mix of available assistance. The greater scarcity of aid in the 1980s and the federal government's shift away from grants to loans have undoubtedly discouraged minority and disadvantaged students. People at the bottom of the economic ladder are hurt the most. We all know that minority enrollments in higher education are dropping. The data sources may not be entirely consistent, but there is overwhelming evidence of a decline in black enrollments in this decade. The reasons for this are many and complicated, but part of the cause is surely financial.

Yes, we must do all we can to insure that minority students are better prepared academically to enter college, but if we deny them ways of *paying* for that education, our reform efforts are not going very far. And, let's face it, the financial question—in terms of higher education—is very near to the heart of equity and access issues in America.

Excellence and equity are inseparable: if the movement to improve education for the students of this nation is to be truly meaningful, it must include *all* students. Our fastest growing age and population cohort—blacks and Hispanics—cannot continue to send disproportionately fewer of its members on to higher education. That is not merely a matter of social injustice, but the promise of an economic disaster as well. In very practical terms, we have to make sure that our schools are

able to educate these youngsters successfully for the needs of the labor market of the future. As Flo McKenzie has commented, education is a lot less expensive than ignorance.

Making sure of this requires a radical change in the way we think of educational accountability. In the old system, to pick up on Jim Freedman's "paradise lost," quality is typically defined in terms of standards that must be met. We need a successful *new* system that will have standards that are just as high or higher, but one in which quality is defined in terms of the proportion of students who are enabled by that system to *meet* those standards.

Such a definition of educational quality—including performance as well as standards—can truly reconcile educational quality and equality, creating educational opportunity while delivering educational quality to all. Educational achievement need not be constrained by race, class, or national origin. Educational equality for some can best be realized when we seek educational advancement and achievement for all.

How do we do it? I don't have all the answers. But I do believe that absolute priority must be given to improving our teaching force. This means rigorous reform in the teaching of teachers. I agree with Checker Finn that we must also pay more attention to outcomes than to inputs. Instead of prescribing more courses or longer school years, we should define what students need to know and be able to do—this is the spirit of the College Board's so-called Green Book, *Academic Preparation for College*, which grew out of the Educational EQuality Project—and then support programs that demonstrate achievement of those results. And, of course, we must insist that government—local, state, and federal—help, not hinder, these efforts by providing the kind of financial support and moral leadership required. I must add, too, my support for something else Checker said. We in education need to demonstrate stronger moral leadership and not be heard or seen as just another interest group.

Bringing about these changes is not going to be easy, but with commitment, courage, and some luck, I think it can be done. Which brings me to one final point on this subject, and on our spiritual host for today, Charles Sumner. Mr. Sumner thought that no speech, however brief, was complete without at least one good Latin quotation, despite the fact that his advisers warned that every Latin phrase he used cost him a vote. I guess it shows my age, but I came through the Chicago public school system at a time when we all took Latin in high school, so I enjoy doing this, even though I wasn't very good in Latin. Following Mr. Sumner's lead and disregarding the warnings about losing votes, I offer the following to those of us charged with meeting the kinds of challenges to education we will face in the years ahead. Actually, there are two quotes, and they're both from Virgil.

The first is: *Audentis Fortuna iuvat*—Fortune is ally to the brave.

The other is: *Tempus fugit*. Time, indeed, does fly—and the future will be here before we know it. If it is to be the future we choose, we must work to make it so, now.

THE COLLEGE BOARD

The College Board is a nonprofit education association serving students, schools, and colleges through programs designed to expand educational opportunity. Its members are more than 2,500 secondary and higher education institutions and schools, systems, and associations; and its programs in guidance, admissions, placement, financial aid, and credit by examination assist some five million students each year who are making the transition from school to college or who are already attending college. The Board is also chartered to sponsor research, to provide a forum to discuss common problems of secondary and higher education, and to address questions of educational standards.

In addition to its headquarters in New York City, the College Board maintains six regional offices located throughout the country and offices in Puerto Rico and Washington, D.C.

THE COLLEGE BOARD IN WASHINGTON

Washington in 1967 was entering a new era in the federal responsibility for American education. It was a time of high hopes and ideals. The post-Sputnik education reform movement was past; so were the political and ideological battles over the legitimacy of federal aid to education. Federal support was embryonic but growing rapidly. Educational equity and individual opportunity had become the overriding imperatives of federal policy.

Washington in 1987 presents a different scene for education. The growth era has ended, but federal aid to education, especially postsecondary student support, is a multi-billion-dollar enterprise. The stakes are high for students, schools, and colleges. Education has never been as salient in public policy debates. Excellence, reform, and American competitiveness abroad have joined equity as the focus of federal policy interests in education.

Meanwhile, much of the initiative in education policy-making is centered in the state capitals. Governors and state legislatures have become principal agents in the education reform movement of the 1980s.

Twenty years ago, the College Board established a "listening post" in Washington to monitor federal developments following passage of the Higher Education Act. In the intervening years, the Board's Washington Office has become a liaison to both federal and state governments to carry out the Board's mission of broadening and equalizing educational opportunity. From the beginning, the Washington Office has sought to bring the best information and analysis to bear on policy issues in education. With support from the Ford Foundation, the office has built a program of policy research that has won respect for quality, objectivity and usefulness to administrators and policymakers.

Lois Rice, senior vice president of Control Data Corporation (and former vice president of the College Board), reflects: "The College Board should take pride in having initiated the first public policy analytical group among the Washington-based education associations—one that then [20 years ago] and now seeks to foster a more just society by focusing its efforts on expanding equal educational opportunity."

Today the office is engaged in the evolving debate over how society should divide the cost of higher education among parents, students, in-

stitutions, and taxpayers. In the local community the office is also proud to play a continuing part in fostering educational access for the disadvantaged through the Educational Opportunity Center of Washington, D.C. This program carries on a 20-year tradition that began with Project OPEN, whose first director, in 1967, was Floretta D. McKenzie.

THE COLLEGE BOARD WASHINGTON OFFICE

Staff

Lawrence E. Gladieux
Executive Director

Janet S. Hansen
Director for Policy Analysis

Irene K. Spero
Director for Government Relations

William Hoffman
Assistant for Government Relations

Gwendolyn L. Lewis
Senior Policy Analyst

Jamie P. Merisotis
Research Assistant

Beverly A. Beard
Office Manager

Diane C. Erving
Secretary

Simone L. Katchay
Secretary

Gladys Lewellen
Secretary

Roberta Merchant
Secretary-Receptionist

Mary P. Morgan
Director, Educational Opportunity Center

William O. Jackson
Assistant Director

Ismat Abdal-Haqq
Educational Counselor

David O. Green
Educational Counselor

Pamela G. Lamberth
Educational Counselor

Linda D. Latney
Educational Counselor

Rhonda R. Robinson
Educational Counselor

Charles Webb
Educational Counselor

Sharon G. Williams
Administrative Assistant

Brenda Farmer
Clerk-Typist

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE COLLEGE BOARD

Officers

John T. Casteen, III
Chairman

Robert H. McCabe
Vice Chairman

Trustees

Don M. Betterton
Lloyd Bond
Edwin H. Cooper
Alice C. Cox
William F. Elliot
Stanwood C. Fish
Betty J. Guest
Caspa L. Harris, Jr.
Mari-Luci Jaramillo
Eloise L. Lee
Arturo Madrid
Carolyn S. McAngell
Floretta D. McKenzie
Eleanor S. Morris
Susan C. Norwood
John W. Porter
Linda B. Salamon
Francisco D. Sanchez, Jr.
Mary Anne Schwalbe
Donald M. Stewart
Carmen M. Terrazas
Scott D. Thomson
Dean K. Whitla

ADVISORY PANEL TO THE WASHINGTON OFFICE

Kenneth H. Ashworth
Chairman

Andre L. Bell
Lloyd Bond
David W. Breneman
Virginia C. Coleman
Joseph M. Cronin
Gregory Fusco
Judith Dozier Hackman
Arturo Madrid
Kevin R. Sullivan